Both LR 15-1 and FRCP 15(a) allow for a litigart to seek 2 leave to file an amended Complaint. The filing of the attached 3 proposed Amended Complaint will not prejudice any of 4 the Defendants because they have not been served in this action yet. Further, the filing of the attached proposed Amended
7 Complaint at this time, before the Court enters its screening 8 order, saves time for the opposing parties insofar as they 9 will not be forced to begin responding to the original Complaint 10 and then have to respon to an Amarded Complaint 2. Foregoing Usage Of Standard Civil Rights Complaint Form FRCPY provides that this Court may administer the Local 13 Rules in any way which ultimately secures the just, spendy, and 14 inexpensive determination of every action and proceeding. a. Section 1983 Claims Are Ancillary The primary purpose of this action is to challenge the 17 constitutionality of Senate Bill No. 2 (1957); 1957 Statutes of 18 Nevada, Chapter 2; NRS 220-170; and its progery, the codified 19 Nevada Revised Statutes. All of the other claims derive from 20 the enforcement, protection, and concealment of their intirmities 21 and injurious nature. In short, this is toremost an action brought 22 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. \$ 2201. b. Substantive Pue Process Claims 23 Even prisoners who pay the filing fee upfront are subject to have 25 their Complaints screened when sving government officials/employees.
26 This puts us on somewhat unequal footing insofar as not having
27 an apportunity to be heard before certain claims are dismissed 28 sua sponte, in contrast to being able to respond to a motion under

1	FRCP 12(b)(6). In order to properly proffer "historical, textual, or controlling
2	precedential support for the due process rights asserted in the
3	proposed Amended Complaint, it's necessary for me to file a more
4	traditional Complaint rather than be constricted in trying to adhere
5	to the standard form's legal argument citation prohibition leg e.g.
6	Washington v. Glucksberg, 521 US 702, at 720-722 (1997); Cartisle
7	Washington v. Glucksberg, 521 US 702, at 720-722 (1997); Carlisle v. United States, 517 US 416, at 429 (1996).
8	c. Ashcroft v. Tabal
	While NOT having any national security implications as
10	was the case in Asheroft V. Ighal, 556 US 1862 (2009), this
11	action does seek damages against officials at the highest-levels
12	of state and local government in Nevada.
	Further, the intricacies involved in the concealment and
14	observation alleged here in this action require a more detailed
15	pleaking in order to properly set the issues before this Court.
16	Conclusion
17	
18	in all respects. O
19	Duted: 10-26-20 Respectfully Submitted
90	IT IS ORDERED that ECF No. 12 is GRANTED.
21	Outlines Branched
22	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court shall detach and
23	separately file Plaintiff's Amended Complaint.
24	IT 15 50 ORDERED:
25	11 IS SO ORDERED
26	DATED: 4:16 pm, October 30, 2020
27	Brancoweken United States District Judge
28	BRENDA WEKSLER
5.0	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE